

R E P L Y

TO THE

SPEECH OF THE SPEAKER,

AS STATED TO HAVE BEEN DELIVERED ON THE 17th OF
FEBRUARY, 1800.

H. Foster (J.) 1st Baron Orib.

THE FOURTH EDITION.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY JOHN REA, NO. 57, EXCHEQUER-STREET.

1800.

W. E. GLADSTONE

OF THE

SPEECH OF THE SPEAKER



AS STATED TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

DUBLIN

PRINTED BY JOHN BEECHER, 17, EXCHEQUER STREET, DUBLIN

1860

A

R E P L Y,

&c. &c.

S I R,

UPON reading the speech which you delivered in the House of Commons on the 17th of February, and which you have since printed, I was so struck by the apparent misrepresentation of fact, and perversion of argument, it contained, that I could scarcely believe its authenticity.

But, as it is published seemingly by authority, and by the Anti-Union bookfeller, my doubts upon that point vanished.

It then occurred to me, that such a statement coming from your authority, might possibly mislead the public, and produce extended and universal mischief.

I THOUGHT it therefore a matter of duty, that the public should not be misled; or, if deluded, that they should be undeceived.

WITH this view I have taken up my pen, with the professed and formal design of answering your performance: and, as it appeared to me on perusal, that every paragraph demanded a particular comment, it occurred to me that the most clear and concise method of forming an answer, would be to pursue the course you have taken, without the slightest deviation. I shall therefore follow you point by point, section by section, that whoever pleases to compare this reply with *your* original, may be under no difficulty of finding out the passages which I refer to, or of turning to the pages to which my arguments shall apply.

WITH infinite respect for your person, with a high regard for your abilities, with a full persuasion of your general patriotism, I proceed, with reluctance, to the examination of a work which lessens my opinion of your fairness and candour.

NOTHING should have compelled me to observe upon a production which has the impression of your authority, but a sense of public duty, which makes every personal consideration sink before it, and which, in the present crisis, would make submission to mistatement, and acquiescence in sophistry, corrupt and criminal.

You open your speech by declaring, that you will not enter into a re-statement of your objections to an Union, which you so fully detailed last year: I approve of your wisdom; for your statements having been so completely refuted by the arguments of Mr. Smith, and the *Considerations on the commercial part* of your speech, repetition would merely expose you to new attack, and additional confutation.

You

You rejoice, that the advocates of Union lay aside their high sounding expressions of *consolidating, of identifying, and so forth*; but surely you rejoice, when you have the least cause of triumph, for the advocates of Union have, during the course of the session, insisted upon those topics with convincing energy, and victorious argument; they form the never-varying theme of *their* reasonings, and constitute the solid base of *their* system.

WHAT pains and afflicts you, is what you call *their new mode of argument*, their *humiliating descriptions* of their native country, and their researches of history, to prove the *eternal feuds*, the *uncivilized manners*, the *constant and internal broils and jealousies of a savage and restless people*. Are then these representations false and unfounded? or are you indignant at a disclosure of the truth? are you incensed at a true exposition of the real history and genuine state of the country? Do you admit, that an opposition to Union cannot be defended, unless *your* scheme is adopted of overlooking all our distractions and disasters, of blinding the nation to all its miseries and divisions, and of representing, in defiance of fact, and in contempt of the conviction of every man, "*that we are well as we are*"—that the state of Ireland is *a state of political sanity*—and that we ought to take a lesson from *the man who was well, would be better, and took physic and died*.

WHICH is the part of honesty, to conceal the truth or to proclaim it? Which is the part of wisdom, to act upon the real state of affairs, or upon artificial self-delusion? Do you then, Sir, act wisely and honestly, in endeavouring to shut the situation of the kingdom from the eyes of the people, or do *they*, who wish to render them truly sensible to their miseries, that they may be disposed to search for a remedy and prepared to receive it?

SIR,

SIR, this true representation of the internal state of Ireland is brought forward to shew the people of both countries its perilous situation : it is made on the one hand to induce the British Nation to offer those terms of friendship and Union, which are most likely to prevent the renewal of past dissensions, and to establish a general system of happiness : it is meant, on the other, to induce the Irish people no longer to cherish chimerical notions of false pride and independence, which have been the source of their misfortunes, but to consider with calmness and sobriety, the proposal which is held out as the surest foundation of their future tranquillity and happiness.

CAN we, you say, deny, that since 1782, *we have risen in civilization, wealth, and manufactures*, and that their improvement is owing to the *spirit, the content and enterprize which a free constitution inspired.*

It is true, Sir, we have increased in wealth and manufactures, and so long as Great Britain gives us an extensive market for our linens, and for the products of our soil, so long as she admits our great manufactures duty free, and exports them with bounty, so long as she takes all we can produce and manufacture, we must improve in wealth. But, to talk of improvement in civilization, at a time when the atrocities of the Defenders and of the United Irishmen are fresh, whilst the houghings of Galway, and the massacres on the bridge of Wexford, the burnings at Enniscorthy and Scullabogue, are still present to the imagination; at a time when assassinations are still daily and nightly committed in every part of the kingdom, and when gentlemen cannot reside in their country seats without a military guard, is surely a cruel mockery of public distress, and no very slight insult to the understanding of the nation.

Now,

Now, Sir, as to the *spirit*, the *content*, the *enterprize*, which our *free* constitution has inspired? Yes, Sir, we acknowledge readily the *spirit* and *enterprize* which has been displayed; we know well enough the *spirit* and *enterprize* that produced a national convention—a national congress,—the meetings at Dungannon—the projects for a general meeting at Athlone—the associations of the united Irishmen—the Catholic convention in Back-lane—the army of national guards—the associations of the defenders—the organized system of treason, which has pervaded the island—the traitorous alliance with France—the plunder of arms—the fabrication of pikes—the insurrection—the rebellion—the massacres that followed. These, Sir, we acknowledge to be proofs of *spirit* and *enterprize*—of *spirit* misguided—of *enterprize* fatally misdirected; but it was left for your penetration and sagacity to discern that they were symptoms and demonstrations of *content*. Of *content*! Good God! what are we to expect, when you, Sir, so high in authority, so celebrated for supposed moderation, come forward, and gravely tell the people of Ireland, that the period which has elapsed since 1782, has been a period of *content*?

You say, the advocates of Union go further, and deny that our constitution is free, or that it is possible to enjoy liberty under it? Wherever these advocates go, they advance not beyond the truth. You allow we have a *theoretic dependence*: I refer you then to experience, to say, whether we have enjoyed *practical freedom*, or whether we enjoy it now, or whether the lives and properties of the loyal inhabitants of Ireland are, at present, secured by the principles of *freedom*, or by extraordinary power? Whether by constitutional influence, or by military authority? Whether by the attachment of the people to the mild system of our laws, or to the dread of the bayonet? And whence does this deplorable situation

situation arise, but from the *theoretic dependence* of our Legislature, which you avow, and defend, the discontents which have originated on that ground, the factions which make a handle of it, and turn it to the purposes of the worst ambition? And what does a Union propose? *theoretic independence*? This, Sir, you admit: But what are your conclusions? You say, our present theoretic *dependence* has worked practical *independence and content*, which is the reverse of fact; and then you argue, that *theoretic independency* will work practical dependency, which is the reverse of probability. And in order to justify your surmise, you assert, that our properties and liberties will be *ruled by another Parliament, not our own*, although we are to form a considerable and important branch of that Parliament.

THUS, Sir, you express your indignation at those who have the honesty to represent with truth the history and situation of their country: You describe the period which has elapsed since 1782—a period big with faction, conspiracy, and calamity, as a period of *content*. You argue in favour of a state of theoretic dependence against the establishment of theoretic independency: and hold out to the people, that in an Union Parliament, Ireland, so far from being fairly and adequately represented, will not be represented at all.

You next transfer your observations from the principle of Union to the terms of it. I shall state your objections in your own words, and answer them in Lord Castlereagh's.

You try to make a difference between Lord Castlereagh's arguments *last year and now*. You alledge his Lordship stated, that last year *growing wealth rendered us too difficult to be governed by our present constitution*, and that *this year we must take a Union to save us from bankruptcy*.

YOU

You say, that his allegation, that a Union would save this kingdom 1,000,000*l.* a year in war, and 500,000*l.* in peace, is unfounded and ridiculous.

You say, that in the year ending Lady-day 1799, if we had paid 2-17ths of the expences of the empire, we should have paid more than we actually paid by 157,000*l.*

You then take a comparative view of six years instead of seven, (for which period the war has lasted) and alledge that we should have increased the capital of our debt by 10,000,000*l.* and incurred an annual charge of permanent taxes, in addition to those which were imposed in 1793, of 3,356,239*l.* and that the whole taxes of Ireland must have amounted at present in net produce to the sum of 4,156,239*l.*

You then state, that Lord Castlereagh's declaration, that we are running in debt faster than England, is unfounded, because Ireland, during the war, has increased her debt by 14,000,000*l.* and England by 186,000,000*l.*

You then state the peace establishment, and contend, that it ought to be taken at 1,012,000*l.* and not at 1,500,000*l.* as Lord Castlereagh states it; you estimate the permanent income at 2,638,000*l.* instead of 2,300,000*l.* as his Lordship argued, and you leave to cover your peace establishment of 1,012,000*l.* a revenue of 1,238,000*l.* and thus create a surplus of 226,000*l.* in future peace, instead of a deficit of 600,000*l.*

I SHALL, therefore, now subjoin the statement of Lord Castlereagh, as made in your presence in the committee, upon the articles of Union.

“ LORD CASTLEREAGH rose after the Speaker. His

B

Lordship

situation arise, but from the *theoretic dependence* of our Legislature, which you avow and defend, the discontents which have originated on that ground, the factions which make a handle of it, and turn it to the purposes of the worst ambition? And what does a Union propose? *theoretic independence*? This, Sir, you admit: But what are your conclusions? You say, our present *theoretic dependence* has worked practical *independence and content*, which is the reverse of fact; and then you argue, that *theoretic independency* will work practical dependency, which is the reverse of probability. And in order to justify your surmise, you assert, that our properties and liberties will be *ruled by another Parliament, not our own*, although we are to form a considerable and important branch of that Parliament.

THUS, Sir, you express your indignation at those who have the honesty to represent with truth the history and situation of their country: You describe the period which has elapsed since 1782—a period big with faction, conspiracy, and calamity, as a period of *content*. You argue in favour of a state of theoretic dependence against the establishment of theoretic independency: and hold out to the people, that in an Union Parliament, Ireland, so far from being fairly and adequately represented, will not be represented at all.

You next transfer your observations from the principle of Union to the terms of it. I shall state your objections in your own words, and answer them in Lord Castlereagh's.

You try to make a difference between Lord Castlereagh's arguments *last year and now*. You alledge his Lordship stated, that last year *growing wealth rendered us too difficult to be governed by our present constitution*, and that this year *we must take a Union to save us from bankruptcy*.

You

You say, that his allegation, that a Union would save this kingdom 1,000,000*l.* a year in war, and 500,000*l.* in peace, is unfounded and ridiculous.

You say, that in the year ending Lady-day 1799, if we had paid 2-17ths of the expences of the empire, we should have paid more than we actually paid by 157,000*l.*

You then take a comparative view of six years instead of seven, (for which period the war has lasted) and alledge that we should have increased the capital of our debt by 10,000,000*l.* and incurred an annual charge of permanent taxes, in addition to those which were imposed in 1793, of 3,356,239*l.* and that the whole taxes of Ireland must have amounted at present in net produce to the sum of 4,156,239*l.*

You then state, that Lord Castlereagh's declaration, that we are running in debt faster than England, is unfounded, because Ireland, during the war, has increased her debt by 14,000,000*l.* and England by 186,000,000*l.*

You then state the peace establishment, and contend, that it ought to be taken at 1,012,000*l.* and not at 1,500,000*l.* as Lord Castlereagh states it; you estimate the permanent income at 2,638,000*l.* instead of 2,300,000*l.* as his Lordship argued, and you leave to cover your peace establishment of 1,012,000*l.* a revenue of 1,238,000*l.* and thus create a surplus of 226,000*l.* in future peace, instead of a deficit of 600,000*l.*

I SHALL, therefore, now subjoin the statement of Lord Castlereagh, as made in your presence in the committee, upon the articles of Union.

“ LORD CASTLEREAGH rose after the Speaker. His

B

Lordship

“ Lordship said that he by no means wondered at the course
 “ which the Hon. Gentleman had pursued in his argument,
 “ when he recollected that he had ever asserted his satisfac-
 “ tion and content in the situation of Ireland; that he
 “ considered us in a state of health and happiness; that we
 “ wanted nothing to better our condition, and that all *was*
 “ *right and well*. If the Right Hon. Gentleman could in-
 “ deed view with indifference the complicated miseries un-
 “ der which we suffered, and bless the Constitution, which
 “ has produced them, if he could view with calmness and
 “ complacency that system of evils and depravities which
 “ has spread misfortune and desolation over every part of
 “ the island, and if he wishes to continue it as productive
 “ of benefit and happiness, surely his heart must be made
 “ of uncommon materials—nor can he be sensible to the
 “ wretchedness of mankind. It is on this view of things
 “ (his consideration that all is well) that he founds his op-
 “ position, and calls aloud upon every description of the
 “ people, whether loyalists or traitors, to unite against this
 “ measure. And what does he promise us? is it, that after
 “ he has dragged us a few years longer through a state of
 “ wretched insecurity, he should leave the country subject to
 “ the same contests as before—subject to a renewal of those
 “ miseries and struggles which have nearly overwhelmed
 “ us in total ruin. He appeals not only to all political de-
 “ scriptions of men, but to all sects, and places religion
 “ herself in the Anti-Union army. Let them, says he, but
 “ oppose the Union, let them defeat this damnable measure,
 “ we will then settle all our differences among ourselves.
 “ But does he say how he will settle them? does he pro-
 “ pose any plan? does he suggest any system? No; he
 “ leaves every thing open for a renewal of new mischiefs—
 “ for the revival of fresh disorders—for the repetition of a
 “ new gradation from jealousy to discontent—from discon-
 “ tent

“ tent to faction—from faction to conspiracy—from conspi-
 “ racy to rebellion.

“ THE Right Hon. Gentleman had accused him of using
 “ in the last and the present session, contradictory argu-
 “ ments; that last year he had asserted the growing prospe-
 “ rity of Ireland, and this year its poverty and bankruptcy,
 “ and stated them as grounds to prove the necessity of
 “ Union. He begged leave to say, he had by no means
 “ argued in that manner. He had last year stated all the
 “ imperfections, all the anomalies of the Constitution; he
 “ had stated that they had increased, and that they would
 “ increase with the wealth and power of the island; he
 “ now stated, that those imperfections and anomalies
 “ produced those expences which oppressed us, that they
 “ necessitated the continuance of those expences; and those
 “ expences, notwithstanding our increase of wealth and
 “ power, were such as we could not support. It was
 “ upon these principles that he had stated the permanent
 “ future expences of Ireland, as beyond her means; he had
 “ also shewn the necessity of imperial contribution if we
 “ remain separate from Great Britain; and he had shewn,
 “ that the result of this double expenditure, for domestic
 “ and imperial purposes, will lead us to the verge of bank-
 “ ruptcy. This statement was incontrovertible, and the
 “ Right Hon. Gentleman had felt it of so inconvenient a
 “ quality, that he had exerted all his great powers to refute
 “ it. But he asked the Committee whether he really had
 “ refuted his statement? What is the line adopted by the
 “ Right Hon. Gentleman? He makes an estimate of war
 “ expenditure alone, formed on the average of six years, to
 “ answer an estimate which was formed on the average of
 “ seven years, both of peace and war. He forgets, or
 “ omits to state, that during the first three years of the war,

“ our war expenditure was trifling, and that the want of a
 “ greater establishment had nearly produced our entire def-
 “ truction. He closes his statements with the last year, and
 “ leaves out the present year, which is the year of the
 “ greatest expence. Is this refutation? He takes a dif-
 “ ferent average, a less number of years, and excludes the
 “ year of the greatest expence. Is that refutation? The
 “ Right Hon. Gentleman is at a loss to know where to
 “ find the expences of the present year: are not the accounts
 “ for the first six months on the table? have not five
 “ months of the last half year nearly expired? How then
 “ is it difficult to prove the expenditure of that period?
 “ He held an account in his hand, calculated to Lady-day,
 “ and it proved that the whole expence of the year would
 “ nearly amount to 6,000,000*l*. and yet this was the sum
 “ that the Right Hon Gentleman had pleased to leave out
 “ in his calculations. Upon this year, which the Right
 “ Hon. Gentleman omits entirely, I, said his Lordship, have
 “ grounded my calculations, because we must continue that
 “ expence in the ensuing year, and because my argument
 “ was prospective; and I looked to the best criterion of our
 “ future expence, which I measured by the present. The
 “ Right Hon. Gentleman had used another fallacy, he had
 “ not combined the expences of peace and war, and argued
 “ on the double proportion. He had stated the war ex-
 “ pence alone, and said, it was in the ratio of nine to one,
 “ and he omitted to state what would have been our saving
 “ in peace, which would have been nearly one-third of our
 “ whole expence. The Right Hon. Gentleman had ad-
 “ verted, but slightly, to the future peace establishment, and
 “ seemed to skim over that part of the statement. I have,
 “ however shewn, said his Lordship, that our future peace
 “ establishment could not fall short of 1,500,000*l*. a year,
 “ and let him impeach that statement if he can. I have
 “ shewn

“ shewn that the increase of pay to the army was nearly
 “ one-third. I have shewn that the permanent staff of the
 “ militia would amount to above 140,000l. a year, and that
 “ we could not keep up the skeleton of a yeomanry force,
 “ which was indispensable, at a less charge than 60,000l.
 “ Can these charges be avoided? What then becomes of
 “ the Honourable Gentleman’s attempts to equalize our
 “ revenues and establishments, by lowering the latter be-
 “ neath reality, and raising the former beyond any prob-
 “ able produce? He would ask the Right Honourable
 “ Gentleman himself, whether he would be satisfied on
 “ a peace, with an establishment of 12,000 men? He
 “ would not. He would be the first to oppose the idea, and
 “ therefore all his arguments on the smallness of the future
 “ expences in peace were fallacious. I have alledged and
 “ proved, said his Lordship, that if we continue a separte
 “ kingdom, we must have a deficit of 600,000l. a year:
 “ I have stated that every year of war would create an ad-
 “ ditional burthen of 350,000l. a year: that an Imperial
 “ contribution in peace would add 350,000l. more, and
 “ that if the war continues three years we shall have a de-
 “ ficit of 1,500,000l. a year, exclusive of any imperial con-
 “ tribution.

“ But it was asked would Union put down expence?
 “ Would Union produce œconomy? He answered yes.
 “ Union would produce tranquillity; Union would increase
 “ internal security; Union would establish a general fund for
 “ the expences of the Empire, and Ireland could not contri-
 “ bute beyond her proportion. If, said the Noble Lord, I did
 “ not think Union calculated to produce repose, and con-
 “ fidence and security, I should consider it as an inadequate
 “ measure indeed: but it is my firmest conviction that the
 “ first fruit of it will be peace; that peace will lessen our
 “ expences;

“ expences; that we shall become a support to the fabrick
 “ of the British Empire, and no longer hang upon her as
 “ a mill-stone sinking her to the bottom. But how will
 “ Great Britain bear the additional expence of supporting
 “ Ireland? In the first place, I feel assured that the effect
 “ of Union will be to diminish the expences of the empire,
 “ and in the second I assert, that it is better for Great Bri-
 “ tain for a time to spend an additional million, in order
 “ to make this a happy country and to consolidate its re-
 “ sources with her own, than that we should continue to
 “ support the whole of our own expences in a separate
 “ state of insecurity, threatening the existence of the British
 “ Empire. The object, the great object of Great Britain
 “ is, that the two countries should be one; one in prosperity,
 “ in security, in happiness. She is anxious that our wealth
 “ should accumulate, when it will be no longer equivocal
 “ that our resources would prove resources of the enemy,
 “ But she must at present look to our acquisitions with jea-
 “ lous anxiety, while she doubts that Ireland may become
 “ a store-house and magazine for France.

“ LORD CASTLEREAGH further said, that before he
 “ moved any resolution he thought it his duty to make a few
 “ observations upon what had passed upon the subject of the
 “ proposed contribution on the part of Ireland to the ex-
 “ pences of the empire. The subject was in its nature dry,
 “ and to persons not versed in financial considerations dif-
 “ ficult: but it was of the utmost importance that it should
 “ be perfectly understood by every Member of the House,
 “ and that the public should be convinced of the fairness of
 “ the settlement. The article he was going to propose as
 “ settling the future scale of the expenditure of this coun-
 “ try, was one of the great features of the system of
 “ Union; it was necessary therefore that it should be accu-
 “ rately

“ rately scrutinized, and he would endeavour to confine his
 “ reasoning closely to the point, and to condense it into as
 “ narrow a compass as possible

“ IN discussing the question it would be necessary for
 “ him to enter into the statement made by the Speaker on
 “ a former night, and he trusted he should not be consid-
 “ ered as out of the order in adverting to what had passed
 “ on a former occasion. The Right Hon. Gentleman had
 “ stated with his usual ability what he considered would be
 “ the operation of the article before the Committee, and had
 “ raised an impression unfavourable to its effect. He knew
 “ the authority every statement coming from the Right
 “ Hon. Gentleman carried with it, but on an occasion like
 “ the present the effect and operation of the measure ought
 “ not to rest upon the authority or declaration of any man,
 “ the decision of the Committee ought to be the result
 “ of full examination and accurate calculations, which,
 “ could not be refuted.

“ HIS Lordship contended that when he originally sta-
 “ ted that the proportion in which Ireland ought to con-
 “ tribute to the expences of the empire was as 1 to $7\frac{1}{2}$, he
 “ had compared this proportion with the past expenditure
 “ of the two kingdoms in peace and in war—that he had
 “ stated the proportion in time of war to have been as 9 to
 “ 1; the proportion in time of peace as $5\frac{1}{4}$, and the joint
 “ proportion as $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, which nearly corresponded with
 “ what he assumed to be the true proportion.

“ THAT with respect to future expences he had taken for
 “ the basis of his argument the actual current rate of the
 “ present expences of the kingdom, and our probable future
 “ peace establishment calculated at the most moderate ave-
 “ rage

“ rage. And upon these data he had argued that if we
 “ consented to the proportion of $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, this kingdom
 “ would save one million in time of war, and 500,000l. a-
 “ year in time of peace.

“ THIS statement had been impeached by the Speaker,
 “ it was therefore of the utmost importance that the Com-
 “ mittee should accurately investigate the truth and solidity
 “ of his argument.

“ THE first point in his statement which had been im-
 “ peached by the Speaker was, that he had stated the ex-
 “ pences of Great Britain to the 5th of January last, with
 “ the expences of Ireland to the 25th of March next, and
 “ the Speaker had asked on what authority he had stated
 “ our expences to that period.

“ MY answer to this objection, said his Lordship, is, that
 “ I have a knowledge of the expence of the current year
 “ sufficiently accurate to enable me to argue from them.
 “ Above nine months are passed, the accounts are made up
 “ to that period; there can be no fluctuation of expence in
 “ the fourth quarter but in the Military Estimate, and this
 “ is entirely within the knowledge of the Executive Go-
 “ vernment; so that it is impossible that the expences can
 “ vary on either side from the calculation by 20,000l. and
 “ the result of that estimate I have stated to be nearly six
 “ millions. I argue, therefore, as to the expence of the
 “ current year on the best possible data, and I fortify the
 “ argument I have built upon it, which is to prove it the
 “ true ground of estimate for War Expences, by stating
 “ that Government has been obliged to demand from
 “ Parliament an equal establishment and an equal sum for
 “ the ensuing year. On this comparison I stated the saving
 “ to

“ to Ireland, in time of war, to be a million a year, and
 “ the relative expenditure fully justifies that statement.

“ BUT, Sir, the Right Hon. Gentleman has objected to
 “ my going into the expences of Ireland to the 25th of
 “ March next. What has been his own course of argu-
 “ ment? He has taken the expenditure of Great Britain,
 “ ending the 5th of January, 1800, and compared it with
 “ the Irish expenditure up to the 25th of March, 1799,
 “ which in fact is the preceding year. He has made his
 “ calculation upon periods which do not correspond, and
 “ taken them from two years which have no affinity to
 “ each other.

“ I AM confident that the Right Hon. Gentleman did not
 “ make this mistake by design; he must have been misled
 “ by an inadvertency to dates and figures; his conduct
 “ would not otherwise be agreeable to the general line of
 “ fairness upon which he acts. It happens, however, that
 “ the mistake operates most favourably for his argument,
 “ as it lowers the apparent war expences of Ireland by
 “ near 1,000,000l. in the year, and raises the English war
 “ expence by 5,000,000l.

“ BUT the Right Hon. Gentleman, in falsely comparing
 “ the expences of Ireland ending in March, 1799, with the
 “ British expences ending January, 1800, has not even
 “ stated the saving to Ireland correctly: He stated the
 “ British expences at - - - £.32,747,790
 “ The Irish expences at - - - 4,476,864
 “ which, he says, taken at the ratio of 15 to 2, would
 “ give a saving to Ireland of 74,576l.

“ IF the Right Hon. Gentleman had stated the expences
 “ of Ireland correctly, by including charges defrayed by

“ the Voluntary Contribution, the case would have stood
 “ thus :

“ British Expences,	-	-	£32,747,790
“ Irish Expences,	-	-	4,601,864

“ which, borne in the proportion of 15 to 2, would have
 “ produced a saving to Ireland of 199,576l.

“ But now, Mr. Annesley, instead of comparing the
 “ years which do not correspond, let us examine the years
 “ which really do correspond with each other ; that is, let
 “ us take the English year ending 5th January, 1799, and
 “ compare it with the Irish year, ending the 25th of March,
 “ 1799, the expence of Great Britain in this year was not
 “ 32,747,790l. as we might have been led to imagine from
 “ the statement of the Right Honourable Gentleman, but
 “ 27,766,818l.—the expence of Ireland 4,601,864l. and
 “ had this expence been borne by this kingdom in the pro-
 “ portion of 15 to 2, the saving in the year would have
 “ been, not 74,576l. as stated by the Right Hon. Gentle-
 “ man, but 789,784l. British.

“ I now trust that I have established to the Committee
 “ the solidity of the statement which I have made ; and
 “ that I have shewn the fallacy of that adduced by the
 “ Right Hon. Gentleman, in which I by no means impute
 “ to him any design whatsoever to mislead the House ; but
 “ have been obliged to prove, that he has not adverted with
 “ sufficient accuracy to the papers before him.

“ I will now state, said his Lordship, in answer to a
 “ Right Hon. Baronet, that I have additional grounds for
 “ relying upon the experience of the current year as to a
 “ true basis for forming estimates for future years ; and it is
 “ of the greatest importance to establish this point, because
 “ the

“ the Right Hon. Baronet argued that the expences of Ire-
 “ land were likely to diminish, and the expences of Great
 “ Britain to increase. Let us look then what is the fact?
 “ The situation of Ireland, even though the Rebellion is
 “ put down, is such, that Government is obliged to require
 “ the same number of forces for the protection of the king-
 “ dom this year as were demanded in the last; whereas the
 “ security of Great Britain is so greatly improved, that she
 “ has reduced her land forces by 32,000 men, and her sea-
 “ men by 10,000; so that by arguing on the current year,
 “ so far from taking a period advantageous to myself, I
 “ argued upon an unfavourable ground, and should have
 “ been justified in asserting, that our future saving would
 “ have been larger than what I had estimated.

“ THE Right Hon. Gentleman had argued from our past
 “ war expences, that if an Union had taken place previous
 “ to the war, our debt would have been increased by ten
 “ millions. And how had the Right Hon. Gentleman ar-
 “ rived at that conclusion? In the first place, he had taken
 “ a period of war alone, whereas I had argued upon pro-
 “ portional periods of war and peace: Secondly, he had
 “ argued upon the increased capital of the debt of the two
 “ kingdoms, which furnished no true ground of comparison,
 “ and not upon their respective expenditure, which was the
 “ only criterion upon which to found a comparison.

“ I WILL now then, said his Lordship, state the real and
 “ actual expenditures of the two kingdoms for seven years
 “ of war:—

“ The expences of Great Britain amount-

“ ed to

	£. 193,540,404
“ The expences of Ireland	21,536,556

Total,	£215,076,960
--------	--------------

C 2

“ If

" If this expence had been borne in the proportion of
 " 15 to 2, Ireland would have expended during the period
 " more than she has expended by 3,767,792*l.*

" But as a *set off* to this expence, the Right Hon. Gen-
 " tleman has omitted to state the saving which Ireland
 " would have made in a proportional period of eleven years
 " of peace. I stated that the past expenditure of Ireland
 " in peace, compared with that of Great Britain, was in
 " the ratio of 5 3-4ths to 1; that accordingly there would
 " have been a saving to Ireland in peace, if an Union had
 " taken place, of 236,000*l.* a year. If this sum had been
 " suffered to accumulate at 5 per cent. compound interest
 " for 11 years, it would have produced at the opening of the
 " war a sum of 3,369,205*l.* If then this sum, which might
 " have been produced by the accumulation of our savings
 " in time of peace, were to be placed against the excess of
 " our expence in the seven last years of war, it would be found
 " that, instead of the country having expended ten millions
 " more, if we had been formerly united with England, she
 " would not have spent in the 18 years more than 398,000*l.*
 " in addition to her real expenditure.

" BESIDES, Sir, as another *set off* to the Right Hon. Gen-
 " tleman's statement, I have a right to assume that, if an
 " Union had been long ago accomplished, our wealth and
 " prosperity at this day would have been greater, and that
 " the same amount of taxation would have been much less
 " severely felt; and I have further a right to state, as a *set*
 " *off* against the argument of the Right Hon. Gentleman,
 " and which in fact in itself fully explains why I cannot
 " state the same saving on past, as must happen in our future
 " expenditure in time of war—that during the first four
 " years of the present contest, this Kingdom was not placed

" on

“ on a war establishment, and was not in a real posture of
 “ military defence, but from the weakness of her preparations
 “ was exposed to the utmost dangers; and I have a right to
 “ assume, that if this Kingdom had been in a real state of
 “ defence in the first four years, as she has been in the last
 “ three years of the war, that instead of this Kingdom ex-
 “ pending more than she has, if the Union had previously
 “ taken place, her saving would have been considerable
 “ indeed.

“ I CONCEIVE the war naturally divides itself into two
 “ periods: the one antecedent to the adoption of a military
 “ system; the other subsequent to the invasion attempted in
 “ Bantry Bay in 1796. In the former period, the protection
 “ of the British navy alone was deemed to be sufficient and
 “ adequate; in the latter, it was conceived, that were this
 “ kingdom to rely upon that defence alone, she would be con-
 “ tinually subject to the most imminent danger. Gentlemen
 “ would recollect the conduct of Parliament at that time. It
 “ was felt, that the kingdom had fortunately experienced a
 “ great *escape*, that a similar risque was not to be incurred, and
 “ they pressed government, on all sides of the House, to an
 “ immediate augmentation of the military force; to the
 “ adoption of that establishment, which has since continued,
 “ and to which alone this island owes her preservation and
 “ security. The attempt of landing in Bantry Bay took
 “ place Christmas 1796; we must therefore date the com-
 “ mencement of the war system from Lady-day, 1797.
 “ It was then the principle I have stated was first acted
 “ upon—a principle essential to the existence of this coun-
 “ try, and from which there is not a military man in the
 “ empire, who would declare we could with safety de-
 “ part.

“ THERE is another principle which I must assume as a *set*
 “ off to the arguments of the Right Hon. Gentleman. It

“ is

" is known that no kingdom can make its greatest exertion
 " at once; it requires several years to draw forth all the
 " powers of a state, and to raise its military exertions to
 " the highest pitch. The expences of England did not
 " come to their height till the third year of the war. Ire-
 " land did not begin her true system of defence till 1797.
 " I am therefore doing injustice to my argument, when I
 " compare the Irish expence, beginning in 1797, with the
 " extended expence of Great Britain at that period; for
 " the exertions in Ireland only began in that year, and in
 " England they had already reached their maximum.

" I WILL, however, compare the three years of Irish
 " expences from 1797, with the English expences for the
 " corresponding period. What is the result?

" THE expence of Great Britain for the three years	
" was	£92,088,094
" Of Ireland	13,324,135

£105,412,229

" IF Ireland had borne this expence in the proportion of
 " two to fifteen, she would have saved in the three years
 " 912,697l. British, or upwards of one million Irish.

" I HAVE now then completely made out and established
 " my proposition, that if our expences continue as at pre-
 " sent, we shall save in war 1,000,000l. a year.

" THAT in the last three years, if we had contributed in
 " the proposed proportion, we should have saved above a
 " million.

" AND that the proportion can never be unfavourable to
 " us, unless we recur to a system under which the public
 " safety

“ safety was imminently risked, and which never can a-
 “ gain be adopted without sacrificing every principle of
 “ security.

“ If, however, Mr. Annesley, my statement as to the
 “ war expence has been impeached, no question has been
 “ made as to the saving of 500,000l. a year, which would
 “ arise from an Union in time of peace.

“ If I had argued that our expences in war, under an
 “ Union, would not have exceeded the war expences when
 “ we were separate, I should have proved enough for my
 “ argument, by shewing the advantage which would arise
 “ to us in peace. But I have done more: I have proved
 “ the advantage in time of peace, which no man questions;
 “ and I have also proved our saving to be as certain in time
 “ of war, provided our establishment is such as the public
 “ safety demands, and that as it now stands it would ex-
 “ ceed 1,000,000l. a year.

“ THE Right Hon. Gentleman stated, that if Ireland had
 “ been incorporated before the war, that not only our debt
 “ would have been higher by 10,000,000l. but that in ad-
 “ dition we should have borne our share of the assessed and
 “ income taxes, to which Great Britain has been subject for
 “ the last three years.

“ THE Hon. Gentleman's calculations were here built on
 “ a fallacious principle. He did not compare expenditure,
 “ which was a simple principle, but compared debts which
 “ had been borrowed on different rates of interest, and on
 “ different capitals. He would allow, that if the debts of
 “ the two countries had been borrowed in common, if those
 “ revenues applicable to current services had been propor-
 “ tional,

" tional, if the funds in which they were borrowed had
 " been the same, and both had raised a corresponding pro-
 " portion of their supplies within the year, that his compa-
 " rison would have been fair, but as all these circumstances
 " were different in the two countries, they admitted no true
 " comparison. The simple method, on which no mistake
 " could arise, on which no confusion could take place, was
 " the comparison of expenditures. But this would not suit
 " the Right Honourable Gentleman's purpose, he had there-
 " fore involved three facts together—the revenues, the
 " loans, and the extraordinary war supplies, and so compli-
 " cated his statement as to make it appear favourable to his
 " purpose, though really inexplicable. He does not state
 " the expenditure simply, but argues on the mode of sup-
 " plying that expenditure. It is of no consequence as af-
 " fecting the proportion, whether the expenditure of each
 " country be raised by loan, by assessed taxes, by income
 " tax, or by all together, the question is not as to the mode,
 " but to the *quantum* of supply. If then the question of ex-
 " penditure be alone regarded, which is the only sound
 " ground of comparison, I have fairly made out that in a
 " reference to past expences in peace and war, this kingdom
 " would not have been a loser by the Union, that on the
 " former peace establishment she would have been a gainer,
 " that in future we shall gain on the estimate of our present
 " expences 1,000,000l. a year in war, and 500,000l. a year
 " in peace, and that the statement of the Right Hon. Gen-
 " man, as to our loss of ten millions if the Union had
 " taken place before the war, is fallacious to the last de-
 " gree, and utterly unfounded.

" I SUBMIT, Sir, to the Committee that I now have fully
 " confirmed and established my statements against the
 " Right Hon. Gentleman, and that my argument is suffi-
 " ciently

“ciently made out against those who argue the question
 “between an Union on one side, and the present system of
 “Irish expences on the other.

“BUT, Sir, this is not the only question: it is a question
 “(as admitted and recognized by the opponents of the
 “measure) between Union on one side, and the expediency
 “on the other of remaining a separate country, and as such,
 “not only of maintaining our present expences, but of
 “making a proportional contribution to the general ex-
 “pences of the empire. The fairness of this principle can-
 “not be denied: no man can contend that we ought to re-
 “main a separate and distinct part of the British empire,
 “receiving every benefit of protection from that empire, and
 “not contributing in any degree to the general expence of
 “maintaining it. This position is so monstrous that Gen-
 “tlemen on the other side, and particularly a Right Ho-
 “nourable Baronet, has been forward in stating the ne-
 “cessity of contribution, and his full disposition to accede
 “to it. Upon this ground, therefore, instead of a saving of
 “1,000,000*l.* in war, and 500,000*l.* in peace, Gentlemen
 “must agree, as I proved on a former night, upon the ex-
 “pediency of adding 350,000*l.* a year to their separate ex-
 “pences in peace, and 2,000,000*l.* a year in war—an ex-
 “pence which would lead this kingdom to bankruptcy,
 “and which Gentlemen would do well to consider before
 “they reject the present system.

“His Lordship then said, that having, he trusted, fully
 “maintained his first statement, he had now only to amend
 “it, by adding, that the saving to Ireland, by uniting with
 “Great Britain, upon the proposed ratio of $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, rather
 “than remaining a separate country, and bearing in her
 “due proportion those expences of the empire, which are

D

“ strictly

“ strictly Imperial, would not be confined to one million a
 “ year in war, and half a million in peace, but would in fact
 “ amount to three millions a year in war and one million
 “ in peace, on an establishment of 20,000 men. In the
 “ latter case, the war expence of Ireland, (exclusive of
 “ charge of debt,) must be seven millions, and the peace
 “ expence two millions: in the former case, the war expence
 “ would be only four millions, and the peace expence one
 “ million.”

SUCH are his Lordship's arguments: You both argued, or ought to have argued, on the same documents which are before Parliament.

THE questions before you are these :

IF a computation is made upon the joint estimate of expence in war and peace, is it fair, in order to refute such a computation, to state the years of war only, and leave out the years of peace? This you have done, and this is the first instance of your unfairness.

2. IF a war has lasted seven years, and if a computation is to be made of war expence, is it fair to make a computation on six years only, and to leave out the seventh year, which is the year of the greatest expence? This you have done, and this is the second instance of your unfairness,

3. IF two nations raise their supplies in different ways—one on a single capital, at a high rate of interest, the other on a double capital at a low rate of interest, is it fair to measure the expences of these nations by the capital of debt they have incurred? This you have done, and this is the third instance of your unfairness.

4. IF

4. If a nation raises its supplies partly by loan, partly by annual taxes, by assessed taxes, or by taxes on income, is it fair to complicate the mode of raising supplies with the amount of those supplies? This you have done, and this is the fourth instance of your unfairness.

5. If a nation, finding that adopting a narrow system of defence, has exposed itself to conquest, and if, in order to prevent the repetition of such danger, it changes its system, and adopts an extended system of defence on the true principles of security, is it fair to calculate war expences upon the narrow system which has been exploded, or upon the extended system which is found necessary? This you have done. Here is another instance of your unfairness.

THESE are your methods of arguing as to our war expences. By these unfairnesses you endeavour to prove that an Union would have increased our debt by 10,000,000*l.* and our taxes by three millions; whereas Lord Castlereagh proves that a Union, on the average of the past years of war and peace, would not have been injurious in point of expence, on the average of the three last years, would have been highly beneficial, and upon the present rate of our expences would produce a saving of 1,000,000*l.* a year in war, and 500,000*l.* in peace.

THE public must decide between you.

You object to Lord Castlereagh's statement, that we are running in debt faster than Great Britain, because you say, that we *have run in debt this war 14,000,000*l.* and Great Britain 186,000,000*l.* which is at the rate of twelve and a half to 1.* Now let us examine this fact: The debt of Great Britain, deducting the money raised for Ireland,

the sums redeemed by sale of the land tax, by the sinking fund, and income tax, was on the 5th of January last - - - - - £361,369,604

From this deduct the debt which existed before the war - - - - - 238,231,248

The increase of debt since the war is therefore - - - - - 123,138,356

The total capital of the debt of Ireland is at present - - - - - 25,662,640

Deduct the sum paid off by sinking fund 339,863

Deduct the capital of debt which existed before the war - - - - - 2,440,390

Remains capital created since the war 22,882,387

Or in British money - - - - - £21,128,204

It therefore follows, that the increase of the capital of the debt of Ireland is in proportion to the increase of the capital of the debt of Great Britain since the war, as 1 to 5 6-7th, and not as you state in the proportion of 1 to 12 $\frac{1}{2}$. The truth is this: Great Britain, by means of the income tax, is preventing the increase of the capital of her debt, and Ireland, by not adopting the same means of raising her supplies, is increasing the capital of her debt in a rapid progression.

I WILL now prove to you, in addition to Lord Castlereagh's statement, that your estimate of our future peace establishment is fallacious, and that his Lordship's is true.

I WILL take your estimate of 1,012,000l. which you state to have been the permanent establishment from 1785 to 1793, and

and which you assert will be our peace establishment after the peace.

Does not then the increased pay of the army since 1785, amount upon 15,000 men, the forces voted in 1785, to about - - - £220,000 a year.

Does not the staff establishment of the militia, as already voted by Parliament, including 28 days of exercise, amount to 140,000

Is it possible, considering the increased prices for every article of life, for fire, for fuel, for candles, to take a less addition for barracks than - - - 20,000

Estimate of a skeleton establishment for yeomanry - - - 60,000

Is it possible, taking into account the immense quantity of ordnance which has been purchased, the increased necessity of magazines, the additional expence of repairs, the augmentation of the artillery regiments, to believe that the expences of the ordnance will not exceed the expences in 1785 by - - - 30,000

Increase by Maynooth College - 8000

Increase on army baggage - 5000

Increase by Judges salaries - 16,000

By police - 10,000

Increase - - £509,000

Now, Sir, having examined what you state as to the expences of Ireland, I proceed to your observations on the criterions selected by Lord Castlereagh for forming the proportion

proportion of our contribution, and shall, as before, state to you his Lordship's answers in preference to my own.

You say his Lordship omits *internal commerce*, hear his Lordship's answer :

“ The Hon. Gentleman had next endeavoured to impeach
 “ the criterions which had been selected, but it was merely a
 “ negative impeachment ; he had not shewn those to be false
 “ which he had stated, but complained of the omission of
 “ others. He had complained that no criterion had been
 “ established from our internal trade : what was the reason ?
 “ It was impossible to estimate that trade ; he had himself
 “ stated that the value of an income tax would form the best
 “ possible criterion ; but an income tax did not exist in
 “ Ireland, and he could not argue from what did not exist.”

You complain, that he omits *calculating the tonnage of the shipping belonging to each kingdom*. Ireland has hardly any shipping of its own whatever, and Great Britain carries on almost all its trade ; so that if a calculation were made upon the shipping of the two countries, it would be formed upon that article in which they are most dissimilarly circumstanced, and a result would be deduced from a basis which is not a fair ground of comparison.

You further complain that the article of salt is omitted, which is one of general use ; but with what wisdom you have selected this article, is beyond my comprehension. The gross duties on it, you say, were last year in Britain 800,000*l.* in Ireland 90,000*l.* or nearly one to nine. But you forget, as usual, to state *the whole truth* ; you forget to state that the duties in England are ten shillings a bushel, in Ireland only two shillings ; so that if the Irish duty were to be equalized to the British, the produce of the salt duty in Ireland
 would

would be 450,000l. a year, instead of 90,000l. and the proportion, instead of being as one to nine, would be under one to two. I must admit, however, a deduction for the salt used in Scotland, where I think the duty is four shillings a bushel.

THE stamp duties, you say, produce in their gross amount in Great Britain 2,000,000l. in Ireland only 137,000l. and you complain of this criterion being omitted.

WHAT is Lord Castlereagh's answer to this complaint?

"IT was objected, that he did not introduce the produce of stamps in the two countries; and what was the reason? The stamp duties were different in the two countries, as to the rate of duties imposed, and as to the articles on which they were levied; it was therefore impossible to make a comparison where such difference existed."

YOUR next objection is, *that he had omitted the Post-office duties*: "but how could a comparison be made on this article of revenue, when it was known that the rate of postage was different in the two countries, and a comparison could only be truly made if the rates were the same."

"IT seemed as if the Right Hon. Gentleman wished to establish criterions from separate proportions of separate articles; but the real ground he had just taken to establish criterions was this—what quantity of income can any country spend on the different great articles of consumption? It was the result formed from the value of the whole consumption, which could alone form a true criterion; a criterion formed upon a separate article was fallacious, because that article might not be equally relished, and proportionally consumed in the two countries."

You then observe *that you are ignorant of what effect these comparisons, which are omitted, would have in forming a proportion,*

portion, but you add, none should be omitted which can be relied upon; thus artfully insinuating unfairness, and excluding yourself from responsibility for your insinuations. I then will make this answer—

WE can form no certain estimate from internal trade.

AN estimated proportion from tonnage would be unfair in favour of Ireland.

AN estimated proportion from salt would be unfair against Ireland.

AN estimate from stamp duties would be false, because those duties are not the same in both kingdoms, either as to rate, or as to the articles on which they are imposed.

AN estimate on the produce of the Post Office would be false, because the rates of postage in the two kingdoms are different, as well as the regulations as to franking.

THESE observations will, I trust, put an end to future insinuations.

Now let me add a few remarks on your calculations on the produce of revenue. Lord Castlereagh stated it from the receipts in the Treasury, which in 1799 were above 200,000*l.* higher than in any former year. But when he thus argued, he seems to have argued upon an average of the receipts of the last year and the present year, in which he included the Collectors balances, which you suppose he omitted, and he also made allowance for the profit of lotteries.

Produce of 1799,	-	£1,860,000
Do. as computed of 1800,	-	2,650,000
Profit of lotteries in the two years,	-	130,000
		4,640,000
Average of the two years,	-	2,320,000

Was then Lord Castlereagh justified in stating the future produce of revenue at 2,300,000*l.* a year; or did he act unfairly in stating the average of the two highest years of produce as the basis of his calculation?

I LEAVE it now then to every candid man to judge, which is likely to be the real amount of future expences. The establishment of 1785, which you calculate at 1,012,000*l.* or the establishment calculated by Lord Castlereagh of 1,500,000*l.*? Which also is the probable produce of revenue, your calculation formed artificially of 2,638,000*l.*—or a calculation formed on the average produce of the two last years, which are the highest, and amount to 2,300,000*l.*—which is most probable your further surplus of 226,000*l.* or the deficit stated by Lord Castlereagh of 600,000*l.*?

You next proceed to insinuate, *that if the proportion of contribution were to be favourable for Ireland, it will only last twenty years, and that then the advantage will cease—we shall be in the power of Great Britain, and we shall undergo equal taxation when Great Britain is free of debt.* I must again resort to Lord Castlereagh's reply:

“THE Right Hon. Gentleman had contended that to
 “ select the period of common taxation to commence
 “ with the extinction of the debts of the two countries, was
 “ selecting the period most unfavourable to Ireland, but the
 “ reverse was the fact. What will be the case, Sir, when
 “ Great Britain shall have extinguished her debt? she will
 “ have discharged taxes to the amount of twenty millions a
 “ year. She will then have merely her ordinary expences to
 “ provide for, and of course she will want very few taxes in-
 “ deed. If, then, Ireland shall commence a system of com-
 “ mon taxation with Great Britain when her taxes shall be

E

“ few

“ few and low, the taxes of Ireland being common with
 “ Great Britain, will be equally light. In that case the Eng-
 “ lish scale of taxation will descend below the Irish scale
 “ of taxation, and Ireland by adopting it will receive a be-
 “ nefit, not injury.”

You next proceed to the subject of commerce, and you say
*that you framed the propositions of 1785; and you would be
 ashamed to have proposed them, if they had contained so little
 benefit and so much injury as those at present offered.*

Now, what were the objects of your propositions, and in
 what do they differ from the propositions now in discussion?

THE duties existing in 1785 upon British manufactures,
 except in a very few instances, were $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. which
 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was added in the year 1785. Your propositions
 went to continue those duties, and to reduce the British
 duties, which were in general high and prohibitory, to their
 level.

THE present proposal is to establish the general rate of
 duty on British manufactures, not at $10\frac{1}{2}$, but at 10 per
 cent. You therefore glory in having introduced propositions
 which would have continued for ever a rate of duty of $10\frac{1}{2}$
 per cent. and condemn propositions which establish in general
 a duty of 10 per cent.

You know that the exceptions to this principle in your
 propositions are few; as they are also few in the present
 propositions.

I ADMIT that in the propositions of 1785, the $10\frac{1}{2}$ per
 cent. on all articles was to have continued.

AND I allow; that in the present propositions, that duty
 is to be taken off, when it is not absolutely necessary for pro-
 tecting the manufactures of Ireland.

And

And I beg leave to ask, whether you would be ashamed to have proposed, that the interchange of products and manufactures, should be carried on between the two countries free of duty, where duty is not necessary; whether you would be ashamed to have proposed the removal of unnecessary taxes, and the cessation of unnecessary obstacles to mutual intercourse and commerce.

You apply your argument to the schedule, No. 2, *apparel*. You say the duty on this article will be reduced to 10 per cent.—your propositions would have retained it at $10\frac{1}{2}$.

Copper, wrought. The duties on this article would have been fixed by you at $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.—they are now to be fixed at 10.

THE duties on *Glass* were settled by you at $10\frac{1}{2}$, they are now to be fixed at 10.

THE duties on haberdashery, hats, hardware, millinery, paper stained, pottery, sadlery, and manufactured leather, were also fixed by you, except as to pottery, at $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. they are now to be fixed at 10. As to pottery, you stated in your speech last year, that it was physically impossible that Ireland should ever have a pottery—the duties you fixed in 1785, were about 15 per cent. they are now to be reduced to 10. And would you be ashamed to have proposed, that an article should only have a 10 per cent. duty, which you state cannot be manufactured in Ireland:—and would you, to no use and purpose whatever, lay an unnecessary charge upon the Irish consumers, and encourage a system of mutual prohibitions?

So as to the silk manufacture, the real protecting duty which you would have left in 1785, was from $10\frac{1}{2}$ to 11

E 2

per

per cent. would you have been ashamed to propose that it should have been fixed at 10?

I ADMIT your observation as to steel, which seems to have been introduced, as you say, inadvertently, and which, as of no consequence, may be easily settled.

Now, Sir, as to cotton, I will allow, that if the propositions which you introduced into the House of Commons, had passed, as originally framed, the prohibitory duties of from 35 to 50 per cent. would have remained: But you know, that when those propositions came before the British Parliament, *that* parliament naturally and fairly contended against the continuance of those prohibitory duties, as being adverse to the general system of the treaty, and as an unfair and partial exception to it; and you must also admit, that in consequence of the objections and alterations made by the British Parliament, you so far consented to the reduction of those prohibitory duties to a duty of $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. that you introduced a bill into Parliament, containing that specific provision. Whether you intended or not to support your own bill, whether you had made a private agreement with Mr. Orde to oppose your own bill in this particular, I do not say; but I contend, that you were not ashamed in 1785 to introduce into Parliament a bill for reducing the prohibitory duties on cotton to $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and I give this credit to your patriotism, that no power on earth could have forced you to have brought forward a bill fatal to the interests of your country,

BUT what is your charge on Lord Castlereagh? Is it not that he proposes a gradual reduction of the duties on cottons, in order that the manufacturers engaged in that branch may not suffer; whereas your bill in 1785, proposed an immediate, and not a gradual reduction.

But you say, you *would be ashamed to have introduced the present*

present propositions? Are you not more ashamed, as a statesman and legislator, to support the monstrous and destructive principle of prohibitory duties between Great Britain and Ireland? Was not the whole object of the propositions of 1785, levelled against the prohibitory duties laid on by Great Britain, upon the manufactures of Ireland? Were not those prohibitory duties then and since the theme of continual complaints and declamation? and so soon as that system is removed on the part of Great Britain, do you become its advocate on the part of Ireland?

BUT let us hear your language, which, in 1785, you were not ashamed to utter: "Gentlemen undervalue the
 " reduction of British duties on our manufactures. I agree
 " with them, that it may not operate so soon, but we are
 " to look forward to a final settlement; and it is impossible,
 " but that in time, with as good a climate, equal natural
 " powers, cheaper food, and fewer taxes, we must be able
 " to sell to them. When commercial jealousy shall be ban-
 " nished by final settlement, and trade takes its natural and
 " steady course, the kingdoms will cease to look to rivalry,
 " each will make that fabric which it can do cheapest, and
 " buy from the other what it cannot make so advantage-
 " ously; labour will then be truly employed to profit,
 " not diverted by duties, bounties, jealousies, or legislative
 " interference, and from its natural and beneficial course.
 " This system will obtain its real object, consolidating the
 " strength of the remaining parts of the empire, by encou-
 " raging the communications of their markets among
 " themselves, with preference to every part against stran-
 " gers."

SUCH were the principles, such the language, which I say, you were not ashamed to utter in 1785. On that language, on these principles, the present system is produced; and do you now desert and abandon them for the exploded;

ploded, the hostile and destructive system of mutual prohibitions?

BUT let us see the exemplification of your prohibitory system in the article of stockings. The duty on English silk stockings, is 4s. 8d. a pair: This duty is so high, that no British silk stockings are legally imported, whilst it is known that British silk stockings are universally worn by every gentleman in Ireland. You contend, however, for maintaining this absurd duty, which does not even secure the home market to the Irish Manufacture, but merely tends to defraud the revenue and promote smuggling.

Now for your lamentation, that *the taxes on British produce and on Irish consumers will be lessened by 32,000l. a year*, and your commiseration of the miseries of Ireland, by such a system!

Will you permit me to ask, what would have been the case under your Propositions of 1785, by which the general duties on British articles were fixed at $10\frac{1}{2}$, instead of 10 per cent.. Would not the same reduction have nearly taken place? Or do you think a duty of 10 per cent. the ruin, and a duty of $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. the salvation of Ireland? Unhappy and unfortunate country! whose wealth and prosperity, whose industry and manufactures, depends upon the variation of one-half per cent. on the imports of British goods!!!

I ALLOW that you contended for the original propositions: You will admit, that you consented to the bill you introduced. I agree that the Propositions of 1785 preserved the protecting duty on cottons, and that the Bill reduced them. — You will admit that you introduced both. If the Bill was not read a second time it was not your fault, for you defended and supported it with all your abilities. You
might

might, as I have said, have intended to oppose in committee; the reduction of the cotton duties; but this is a mental reservation, which does not appear on the face of the measure.

BUT you state that the case is very different between Lord Castlereagh's propositions and your's, *as the Irish Parliament was to continue to remedy any evil which might follow: but that even the United Parliament cannot alter these articles.* Is then the case really different in the manner you have stated? By the treaty of 1785, would not all power have been taken away from the Irish Parliament, to alter any part of it, without giving up the whole? If after the conclusion of that treaty, the Irish Parliament had, without the consent of Great Britain, deviated from it in a single item, the whole treaty would have been dissolved. The grant of the colony trade might have been revoked; the export of British raw materials might have been withheld; the import of Irish linens might have been taxed.— If it shall not be competent to the United Parliament to alter any tittle in the present treaty, it was as little competent to the Irish Parliament to have altered the treaty of 1785, if it had been ratified.

You proceed to state that *your propositions provided for an effectual preference in each kingdom against similar articles from foreign states, thereby strengthening the security for Irish linens against the foreign in the British market.* To this objection, Lord Castlereagh replied in the following manner:

“ With respect to linens, it is now plain, even from the
 “ admission of the Right Hon. Gentleman, that our local
 “ Legislature could not be relied upon to perpetuate advantages which depended on the British market and the British Parliament. But the Right Hon. Gentleman said,
 “ that an Union would not secure those advantages, because
 “ it

“ it was stipulated in the Propositions of 1785, that Great
 “ Britain should ever give a preference to Irish manufactures
 “ over foreign, and that the plan before the Committee
 “ contained no such provision. But such a provision was not
 “ necessary in his plan, because the Propositions only gave a
 “ preference to Irish linens over foreign; whereas this plan
 “ placed Irish and British linens on the same footing. This
 “ was a security better than any principle of preference: It
 “ was a security founded upon the perpetual interest of Great
 “ Britain, and of the manufactures of Great Britain. He
 “ would now for a moment revert to the Right Hon. Gen-
 “ tleman’s wishes about cottons, and suppose that Great Bri-
 “ tain were to feel in a similar manner with the Right Hon.
 “ Gentleman as to linens; suppose Great Britain were to
 “ take up the general principle of protecting duties, and
 “ adopt that sovereign panacea, which he recommended for
 “ Irish manufactures; and suppose she were to lay a duty
 “ of 10 per cent. on linens, could the Hon. Gentleman
 “ object to the fairness of the measure, although it would
 “ ruin the linen trade of Ireland?”

But surely it was very unfortunate in you to allude to
 the above circumstance in your propositions, when you were
 going to state the duties upon *iron*; for, upon the ground of
 your articles, Ireland must have been obliged to have raised
 her duties upon foreign iron to give a more effectual pre-
 ference to British iron: for, although the power of regulat-
 ing duties on foreign articles was not restricted in your
 propositions by any specific clause, it was undoubtedly limit-
 ed by the principle you have stated, of giving an effectual
 preference to native manufactures over foreign. Nor do I
 see how you can argue, that Great Britain, at the desire of
 Ireland, was bound to continue prohibitory duties upon fo-
 reign linens, and Ireland was not bound, if Britain desired
 it, to impose prohibitory duties on foreign iron.

You

You say that Ireland, in the present state of her manufacture, lays only an import duty of 12s. 6d. per ton on foreign iron; and do not you think it reasonable, that if hereafter Great Britain shall be enabled to supply Ireland with all the iron she wants, at a reasonable rate, it would be proper that the duty of 12s. 6d. should be raised?

WITH respect to raw silk, there can be no reason to imagine that the United Parliament would, more than an Irish Parliament, raise an import duty without necessity. It is laid on in Great Britain for the mere purposes of revenue, in Ireland a duty would not answer that purpose to any considerable amount; and the British manufacturers have no interest in raising the duty, as they draw back the amount of the British duty on the raw material upon the export of their manufacture to this country.

You do not rest much objection upon the corn trade being left open to the controul of the United Parliament; but you insidiously state, that whatever security you may look for from the *integrity* of that Parliament, you can have none in its power of *local information*. I wonder that a person of your sense and candour should so continually repeat, and dwell upon so unfounded an objection. You have often argued, and I think absurdly, that 100 members being a less number than 500, can never carry a question in favour of Ireland in the United Parliament; but I never imagined you could proceed so far as to assert, that they could not give an United Parliament information: but now you contend, that the Irish Representatives will not only lose their power but their knowledge, and be as incapable, from their ignorance, as from their numbers, to serve their country. It seems that the reason for excluding the corn trade from any permanent system of regulation is founded, first, upon the general principle, that every legislature must be disposed to favour the general agriculture of all parts of an empire.

2dly. That it is dangerous to tie up the hands of a legislature upon so delicate an article as the subsistence of the people. 3dly. That as Great Britain is now become in general an importing country of grain, and Ireland an exporting country, there can be no doubt that the United Parliament will give to Ireland a preference in supplying Great Britain over all foreign countries whatsoever.

You say, you do not understand those articles of the Propositions, which state that the duties on hops, salt, and coals, are to continue (not for ever, as you represent, but for 20 years) subject to the present duties on import into Ireland.

Is it of no consequence to the brewers of Ireland, to be assured that the duty on that material article of hops, shall not be raised for 20 years? You state, that the greater part of the duty arose from your exertions—I acknowledge them; but you do not clearly state the truth: You did not alter the duty on hops; but, as great part of the duty, like the duty on coals, was retained as a subsidy in England, and went into the British Exchequer, you fairly argued, that Ireland, being the consuming country, had a right to the value of the duty; and that it was unjust in Great Britain to retain it from Ireland. The principle was undeniably just, and you will allow me to make use hereafter of this *precedent* respecting hops, in which you assume to yourself such financial credit.

Now, as to salt! whoever reads your observations upon this article, would imagine that the greatest possible grievance were to be inflicted upon this devoted country: “*Rock salt raised from one shilling to three pounds a ton—a duty of 500 per cent. on the value to be made perpetual without redemption!*” You ask, do not Gentlemen stare? Yes; but they

they *stare* at such a paltry and unworthy attempt to magnify the effect of a small duty, and to inflame the passions of the ignorant by delusive and exaggerating language.

WHAT, Sir, are the real circumstances of the case? In consequence of the excessive expences of the present war, it was absolutely necessary to look to all articles of general consumption as objects of taxation, it being known in finance, that objects of private luxury, belonging to the upper classes, however highly and vexatiously taxed, produce little revenue; and discourage ingenuity and trade. Salt was an obvious article—it was scarcely taxed at all in Ireland, and it was found, that by laying on so moderate a duty as 2s. a bushel, a poor family would not be taxed above 1s. a year, and that a revenue would be produced of 90,000l. a year. This article of salt pays a duty of 10s. a bushel in England, where it is a *native* article, and whence we can alone procure it, as you stated in 1785. It was natural to imagine that, if no positive regulations were made upon this article, that factious and ill-designing men would insinuate among the lower classes, that by a Union they would be put upon the same footing with Englishmen as to taxes, and that they would pay 10s. a bushel upon salt; and it would be held out, that England had a right to insist that we should not consume her produce at a more favourable rate than her own people. To prevent the lower classes being thus deluded, and to secure them from any increase of duty upon salt, the provision in the article for continuing the present rate of duty was introduced: And did it become a personage of your character and authority to hold up a regulation of benevolence and attention to the lower classes of Irishmen, as an oppression and a grievance, and to make an inflammatory address to their ignorance and passions in a time of distress and scarcity?

THE same wish of inflaming and misrepresenting, appears in your observations upon coals. The British duty upon the exports of this article to Ireland, is 9*d.* per ton, and the Irish duty upon import is 9*d.* per ton more. It is intended by the article, that these duties should continue for 20 years; but that the 9*d.* per ton upon export, should no longer be received by the British exchequer, but be transferred to Ireland, the consuming country, by which regulation, Ireland will gain a revenue of 17,000*l.* a year. With regard to the additional duty of 1*s.* a ton, upon coals imported into Dublin, you know well enough, that the article does not relate to it at all; it was a local duty imposed by yourself, for the purpose of ornamenting Dame-street; and if you consider it as a grievance, you are bound in duty to the citizens of Dublin to procure its repeal forthwith, and to raise a substitute more agreeable to the wishes of the metropolis; it is a duty of your own creation, for the existence and continuance of it you are responsible, not the articles of Union, which do not include it.

But what is the case of England with respect of coals? That article, carried coastways, pays a duty from 3*s.* 6*d.* to 9*s.* a ton, except in the few instances you have enumerated; and is it a matter of grievance, that the people of Ireland should pay 1*s.* 6*d.* a ton for consuming British coals, when the people of England pay from 3*s.* 6*d.* to 9*s.* which latter duty is levied in the port of London? Dublin will have a preference over London in consuming British coals, of 7*s.* 6*d.* per ton, should you repeal the duty which you imposed upon the consumption of that article. With respect to your remark, that the duty of 1*s.* a ton upon coals, in the port of Dublin, is blended with the general duty, it may be true, or it may be false, for I have not time to examine the point; but your observation, that the mistake arises from

want

want of *local information*, is curious in the extreme ; for the accounts were made out by Mr. Wetherall, an Irish revenue-officer in Dublin ; the account was laid before the Irish Parliament by that officer ; and thence you conclude how necessary it is for Ireland to retain its *local* Parliament, for the sake of *local* information, because an Irish revenue-officer has made a mistake in the Irish accounts.

THE next article, you say, is fail-cloth : And here you admit the great benefits which will arise to this manufacture, by its being *deemed British*, and *admitted to equal pre-emption with British in the navy, and equal use in the first sails of every trading vessel* : but you say we have a right to these advantages without an Union—a right ! Upon what principle ? Does Ireland contribute to the protection of the trade of England or of her own ? Does she contribute one shilling to support the navy of the Empire ? and if she does not, upon what principle can she pretend that the British merchant ships ought to be fitted out with her manufactures, and the British navy to be furnished with Irish fail-cloth ? We can have no such *right* but by *Union*.

You are pleased to acknowledge, that the admission of the free import of *British wool is a mark of liberality*. You confess it was not included in the propositions of 1785 ; but that, for your part, you cannot see its particular beneficial effects. Really, Sir, when I reflect upon the speech you printed last year, I am not much surpris'd at this affected blindness. You were then pleased to acquaint the good people of Ireland, that it was impossible for them to have a woollen manufacture ; and certainly it would be gross inconsistency for you to allow, that the free communication of the raw material would be advantageous to Ireland, when you contend that she can never manufacture it. But let us
examine

examine what are the real circumstances of this manufacture. Ireland manufactures already all the wool she grows: She spins so much cheaper than Great Britain, that, although Irish wool is at present considerably dearer than British, she can sell her yarn in the English market at a much cheaper rate than British yarn. It is also known, that the perfection of several kinds of woollen manufacture consists in the due assortment of wool. It follows from these premises that Ireland, unless she grows more wool herself, cannot carry her manufacture beyond its present extent, unless she can get wool from England. Secondly, that as English wool is cheaper than Irish, and Irish spinning much cheaper than English, she will have the greatest material (yarn) in greater quantities, and at lower prices; and, consequently, by judicious management, she may extend her woollen manufacture to the quantity of the raw material which can be procured.

THE value of this staple manufacture of Great Britain may be easily conceived by looking to the value of the export from Great Britain on an average of the last three years; it appears by the accounts now before the House of Commons that the value of woollen and worsted manufactures exported from Great Britain to all the world, amounted to 8,458,567*l.* and the value exported to Ireland alone to 686,567*l.* there can be no reason whatever that woollen and worsted goods may not be made as cheap, or cheaper, in Ireland than in Great Britain; we can have Spanish wool as cheap as the English; we work up all our own wool at present; British wool may be brought to the Harbours of Ireland cheaper than from one part of England to another; provisions are much cheaper than in England; taxes much lighter; and all we have to contend against, is the want of attention in the head manufacturers, and

and the want of industry, and the bad habits of the weavers and labourers. It is a remarkable fact, that the Irish weaver is preferred to any other in Spittle-fields, in Manchester and in Paisley. It is not, therefore, to the want of skill, that any deficiency in our home manufactures is attributable, but to a bad system, bad habits, bad combinations in Ireland, which a free communication with Great Britain will probably remove, and to the desire of making inordinate profits, which can only be counteracted by fair competition.

LINSEED OIL.—You complain of the duties on this article being taken off, as if a common oil press could not be worked as cheaply in Ireland as in England; as if flax-seed could not be imported upon as reasonable terms, and as if Irish flax-seed, on account of the duties on foreign linseed oil, sold for more than it was really worth. It is ridiculous to assert that linseed oil cannot be made as cheap here as on the other side of the channel; and the only reason that I conceive for giving protection to an article that does not require it, is to make it worse and dearer by destroying competition.

You next sum up the whole of the commercial regulations. You object to their removing duties upon seventy articles, as if a tax were in itself a benefit to a manufacture, as if duties were in themselves beneficial to trade. You do not prove that the removal of the duties on any article is injurious to the commerce on that article; but against every principle of trade and manufacture, you seem to contend that duties and taxes are in themselves, and in the abstract beneficial.

You say the resolutions give *no preference to Irish over foreign linens, and take away the security of our compact*: Whereas
 Lord

Lord Castlereagh proves we have no compact whatever to secure our linens, and that by placing our linens on the same footing as the British, we have the greatest possible security, because we have the interest of the British and Scotch manufacture combined with our own in our favour.

You say this system makes perpetual the new and excessive duties on salt, whereas I have shewn that the present duties are low and reasonable, and that the present system prevents their becoming excessive.

You say it renders unalterable the duties on hops and coals, when it merely prevents their increase ; and surely, to obtain raw materials at a moderate duty, which are not of native produce, so far from being an injury is an advantage.

You say it leaves our brewery *unprotected*, allowing only a *countervailing duty* ; and what, Sir, was the case in 1785, when the duty, per barrel, on British beer, was fixed at 4s. 1d. ? Will not the countervailing duty, upon a calculation of the malt and hops used in brewing, be nearly equal to that sum ? and do you contend that the British brewer can undersell the Irish, when the former pays a greater price for malt, for wages, and in most cases even for fuel ; for the great English breweries are all carried on in London.

I HARDLY understand what you mean by your observation, *that no provision is made for retaining our low duties on the import of raw materials* : If you allude to silk and iron, enough has been said on those articles ; if to tin, bark, allum, coals, salt, they are fully provided for.

Your indignation seems so entirely to master your reason, that in the next paragraph to the one on which I have just remarked,

remarked, you seem to consider the advantage of having the full benefit of the navigation act, and of the re-export trade, as of no estimation at all. This was not the chain of your reasoning in 1785. The true construction of the navigation act, the benefit of the re-export trade, were then insisted upon, and truly insisted upon as the greatest commercial advantages which could be obtained. Why are they now so greatly undervalued? Is it because, under the present system, every inducement is held to British capital to settle in Ireland? is it because the re-export trade is now not in the possession of the Dutch, as formerly, but in the possession of Great Britain? is it because a system is preparing to secure to the empire the benefits of that part of commerce? is it because some of the Irish ports are more happily situated for re-export than the ports of Great Britain? The greatest possible stimulus to trade, is the certainty of being able to dispose of the redundancy of every commodity: It is upon this principle that the re-export trade is so highly considered, because, when a nation can supply foreign markets, it is a complete proof that she is able to furnish the full supply of her own. Great Britain, at present, re-exports foreign and colony goods to the amount of 14,000,000*l.* a year. The net profit on this trade, at 10 per cent. is 1,400,000*l.* a year, besides the advantages she derives from the great quantity of shipping, and the number of sailors she employs in that service; and would a participation in this trade be of no benefit to Ireland?

Your investigation of Lord Castlereagh's system leads you next to consider the subject of revenue. You state that it takes off 32,000*l.* a year *protecting duties, raised upon British goods, and removes 44,000*l.* a year, paid on the export of cattle, hides, tallow, butter, beef, pork, and linen-yarn. For what, you ask, are these alterations desired—for Ireland? no—but to give our provisions the cheaper to Great Britain.*

Is then this the true principle of the present measure? and is this a fair and becoming representation of the regulation? In the first place, what can be so absurd as that the communication of all articles of provision, and all materials of manufacture, between the different parts of the same empire, should be clogged and restricted with duties and taxes? What would you say, were Great Britain to lay new duties upon tin, bark, allum, salt, and hops, exported to Ireland? and how did you expose Mr. Flood in 1785, when he started such an idea? and if you would complain against such a proceeding, as most unkind and unwarrantable, in Great Britain, upon what principle can you contend for retaining duties on the provisions you export to her market? You were the first to assert the unfairness of Great Britain in raising a revenue upon the consumption of Ireland: You asserted it in the article of hops; you took merit for your conduct, and you induced Great Britain to give up the subsidy on that article to Ireland. Great Britain acknowledging the justice of your principles, is now prepared to follow it in the article of coals. Is that conduct fair in Ireland, which in Great Britain is unjustifiable? Do you contend that we have a right in the articles of provision, &c. to raise a revenue on the consumption of England, but that England has no right to raise a revenue on our consumption?

BUT, in order to create an opposition to the Union, there is no principle you ever supported, that in this speech you do not contradict.

You contended formerly against raising duties upon the consumption of another country, you now contend for it. You declared against the system of prohibitory duties, and you now declare in favour of them. You contended in 1785, for a low system of duties, and you now oppose that system: You then expatiated on the great advantage of a

re-

re-export trade, and you now consider it as of scarcely any advantage at all.

You next advert to the revenue we are to obtain in lieu of these duties which are to be remitted. You have candour enough to own, that *Great Britain giving up the duty on coals to the amount of 17,000l. a year, is a fair return as far as it goes.* You then observe upon the duties on *subsidy goods to the amount of 9000l. which are now retained in England, and which she is to retain no longer.* And in order to weaken this concession, you put two suppositions, neither of which I can understand. The case is this—Great Britain retains a small duty, called a half subsidy on colony goods exported to Ireland, and so far levies a revenue on the consumption of Ireland: Ireland lays a less duty by the amount of that half subsidy on colony goods coming through England, than when coming from the colonies directly. The actual amount of duty paid on the consumption of colony goods in Ireland, is in both cases the same; what then is done by this regulation? Great Britain, as in the case of hops, and as in the case of coals, gives up a revenue levied upon Irish consumers. You had just stated that her giving up the export duty on coals, was a *fair and effectual return*; and why you should not state her giving up the half subsidy on colony goods, as *equally a fair and effectual return*, is beyond my comprehension, unless you chuse to put in, what would not become you, the plea of ignorance.

You next object to the offer of 58,000l. a year, from the India Company, out of the 500,000l. a year, which that Company covenanted to pay Government. You say it has not, and will not be paid; That revenue is, however, in the course of payment; and in consequence of the late acquisition of Tippoo Sultaun's dominions, it is likely to be as regular and permanent a source of revenue as any in the possession of Great Britain.

You seemed surpris'd to find that Ireland is also to have her share of twelve millions to the sinking fund, and of the surplus of the consolidated fund, which is provided by the East India act of 1793; but finding that we are to receive it, you of course deny that it is likely ever to be paid, so as to be beneficial to Ireland.

You conclude your remarks on commerce, by observing, *that the arrangement of duties and of trade, between the two kingdoms, requires a quick and ready knowledge of the local circumstances of this kingdom, which can only be effectually obtained by a resident Legislature.*

Now I ask you, Sir, what was your treaty of 1785—was it intended to be a *final and perpetual* settlement of commerce between the two kingdoms or not? And if it was intended to be final and perpetual, what effect could a Resident Legislature have had on what was irrevocably settled? What would have been the use of a *quick and ready knowledge of local circumstances, as to duties and trade*, which were *unalterably* adjusted.

BUT all this reasoning goes on the supposition that the Irish Members on crossing the channel will lose their local information. I suppose all your commercial knowledge will evaporate at Holyhead, and that by the time you arrive in London, you will forget that such a country as Ireland exists. Surely, Sir, it may be possible to frame an institution for transmitting to London regularly the most minute accounts of Irish affairs; and I should imagine that a communication between Members and their Constituents may still remain.

THERE is one part of your commercial system of 1785, which you have omitted to mention, I mean the perpetual grant of the surplus of the hereditary revenues, over and
above

above the gross produce of 656,000*l.* for supporting the navy of the Empire; which surplus at this period, would have produced above 100,000*l.* a year, and would have made an addition of yearly taxes to that amount absolutely necessary. This proposition you was not *ashamed* to make, though Mr. Brownlow stigmatized it as a disgraceful tribute.

As you have endeavoured to make your recapitulation in favour of the system of 1785, I shall now beg leave to follow your example—

THE present system reduces all duties between the two kingdoms to 10 per cent. when any duty is necessary for the protection of Ireland, and takes off all duties entirely, where they are unnecessary.

YOUR bill of 1785 reduced all duties in Great Britain to the existing duties in Ireland, which were in general $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

YOUR bill allowed several prohibitions in England to continue. This system removes them all, and gives us a full communication of the wool of Great Britain.

YOUR bill provided for the immediate reduction of the duties on cottons to $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

THIS system, consulting the interests of the manufacturers, will gradually reduce them to 10 per cent.

YOUR bill suffered Great Britain to retain duties on the consumption of Ireland, and Ireland to raise revenues on the consumption of England. This unfair policy is repealed by the present system, and Ireland gains by it 26,000*l.* a year.

By your bill a perpetual tribute was granted to England, which at this day would have exceeded 100,000*l.* a year.

By

By this system we gain 58,000*l.* a year from the India company, pay no tribute at all to Great Britain, become entitled to share in whatever territorial revenue Britain may receive from her foreign possessions, and effect such an arrangement of Finance, as will save us 1,000,000*l.* a year in our future war expences, and half a million in our peace establishment,—an arrangement which a Union, and a Union alone could procure.

HAVING dispatched commerce and finance, you proceed to state without fear of contradiction, that in every *step the present arrangement makes, it breaks in upon some established constitutional principle, and that it is one course of unconstitutional and dangerous innovation from beginning to the end.*

You will, I trust, admit, that in making any alteration whatsoever in a constitution, it is unwise to advance beyond the line of necessity. Upon this principle the article which respects the peerage of Ireland is framed, in order to preserve, as far as possible, all the advantages which that body enjoys at present, and to effect the necessary changes with as little personal inconvenience or injury as can be devised.

THE Peers of Ireland have from time immemorial enjoyed the privilege of sitting as representatives for the Commons of Great Britain. This privilege, so enjoyed, has been attended with no inconvenience whatever to the constitution, and has been considered as a personal advantage of great importance and value. The present system does not therefore create any Mongrel Peer, as you are pleased to state in contempt; but merely preserves inviolable an existing privilege, which there is no sound reason to destroy, and instead of producing, prevents an unnecessary change.

You next object to the Representative Peers being elected for life, *against the principle of the Septennial Bill, and the articles*
of

of the Scotch Union: But will not an election for life give greater dignity and independence to the Peerage? Does it not more agree and coincide with the principle of the Peerage, which body is not in its nature representative? Will it not destroy all that electioneering cabal, that ministerial interference, which mixes with the Scotch elections?

I CERTAINLY will admit with you, that many Irish Peers, in consenting to the measure of Union, make a sacrifice of much personal consequence, but they know the value of their honours, and their estates, and that it is by a Union alone they can be secured. But do you suppose, because an Irish Peer has not an immediate prospect of becoming a Peer of the empire, that he will abandon all the pursuits, and all the duties of a nobleman. You may thus argue, *ad invidiam*, in order to irritate and inflame; but such insinuations can have no weight upon a question in which the very existence of hereditary honour is concerned, and upon which depends essentially the security of every estate in Ireland.

BUT the Union, you say, is *not less unconstitutional as to the Commons*, because it reduces the number from 300 to 100; yet it happens that both the increase and the diminution of the number of representatives, has taken place at various times in England, and both the one and the other have been considered by political writers as agreeable to the constitution.

BUT you say, that the number of 300 is necessary to preserve the balance of the three branches of the constitution. Let us see then if your principle has any foundation or weight, whether it will not be carried completely into effect by the present arrangement. The Commons of Ireland are at present in proportion to the Lords as 3 to 2. The number of the Imperial House of Commons will be 668, the number of the Imperial House of Lords about 330. The weight

weight therefore of the Commons, in proportion to the other branches, instead of being diminished in the Imperial Parliament, will be increased.

You next object, that the Irish members should be equally qualified with the British; or that each member for a city or borough should at least have a property of 300l. a year, and each county member of 600l. I believe, Sir, if this regulation had existed, and been attended to in Ireland, an Union at this day would not have been necessary: Nothing is of such essential consequence to the stability of a constitution and the permanence of a government, as to secure them from the attacks of needy adventurers, whose tongues are their fortunes, whose want of principle their estates. It is by the obtrusion of such characters upon the Senate, that the people are continually led astray, and the dignity of Parliament polluted.

BUT in order to see the injury which the representative body will suffer from the present measure, it is necessary to take a short view of the House of Commons in its present state.

THERE are about ten large cities, wherein the electors are numerous, and the elections sufficiently popular.

AND there are 108 boroughs in various degrees, subject to private influence, and many of them considered as private property, and these are in the possession, or under the direction, of about 80 individuals.

A LEGISLATURE so constructed, however it may act with prudence and patriotism, however its exertions may be employed for the benefit of the country, can never give security or dignity to administration, can never be a popular organ between the crown and the people, or secure the people's confidence and attachment. Men who are supposed to possess the representation as their property, will ever be
suspected

suspected of using it as their property, and of converting it to the ends of private advantage rather than of public good.

BESIDES it, in fact, renders the House of Commons perpetual, and prevents an appeal to the people upon a dissolution of Parliament, whilst eighty individuals can command two-thirds of the Representative body, a dissolution of Parliament is not an appeal to the people, but to 80 individuals.

Now what has been proposed in the Union articles? Is it not, that the counties should send, as at present, two members each? that Dublin and Cork also should each send two, the University 1, and that 31 Towns, the most considerable for wealth and population, should each send one to complete 100 members? which number is fixed upon the joint consideration of our population and wealth, compared to Great Britain.

WHAT would be the consequence of this scheme? It would act as a moderate, yet complete, and a safe, because a final reform of the House of Commons, and would take place without any contest or convulsion. It would destroy the dangers arising from oligarchical influence and cabal—would remove all suspicion of corrupt practices—would place the entire Representation upon the proper basis of numbers and property—would, from its fairness and equality, annihilate the sources of complaint and dissatisfaction—would be a wholesome, free, and independent addition to the British Parliament—be a fair, an adequate, and unbiassed organ, to speak the sense of the people of Ireland. From the nature of its composition, it would secure more than ordinary attention in the imperial Parliament; by the adequacy of its numbers, it would carry due and proportionate weight—would reflect

honour on the kingdom that sent such a Representative, and increase the dignity of that which embraced it. In such a Representation we might possibly be deprived of the constant efforts of octennial adventurers; we might be deprived of the advantage of fifty enterprising barristers; we might possibly have only as many merchants as at present; we might lose the imputation of being subject to the Borough-mongers—and patriots could no longer inflame the people, with an enumeration of placemen and pensioners, in order to add to the list. The kingdom, in return, would see its Representatives the genuine objects of its free choice, the fair emanation of its power and property, and if the electors did not select the ablest characters who would do justice to their opinions, and give protection to their interests, it would no longer be the fault of the Constitution but their own.

SIR, I will now, with sincerity, admit, that if controverted elections are to be entirely tried in Westminster, great embarrassment, and ruinous expence, might arise to the gentlemen of this kingdom, who shall have the misfortune to be engaged in them: I never have been a great admirer of the Grenville act, on account of its expensive process: Justice, obtained by the ruin of the client, is injustice; but I should readily conceive that a system may be easily devised, of trying every point of fact respecting elections in Ireland, in case it should be necessary to reserve decisions in point of right to a committee of the House of Commons; and as by the Grenville act the House of Commons have divested themselves of the right of judgment in cases of election, and centered it in a jury of their own body, I see not any constitutional reason which prevents the House of Commons from transferring the right of judgment from that jury to another court, if by such means substantial justice can be more effectually, easily, and cheaply obtained. Any person who
has

has read the case of Ashby and White, will see that the method of trying elections has been various in different periods of the constitution; and, I must believe, that the Commons are only tied down to adopt that mode of trial, which, under all existing circumstances, appears most available to the purposes of justice.

I FEAR, Sir, when the subject of extinguishing the close Boroughs is in discussion, your attempt of inflaming the people by the mention of chartered rights, and by an appeal against their violation, will not have the desired success. If there is any one part in the Union arrangement which diffuses general satisfaction, and promotes the acquiescence and consent of the people to the measure, it is this extinction of the the close Boroughs of Ireland, and the new unincumbered importance which is given to the counties: The people will not be irritated by obtaining the great object of their petitions and demands, which they have pursued for twenty years with unabated zeal, and which can now be conceded with safety to our establishments, and with additional security to our connexion with Great Britain.

One consequence, you say, is too striking to be passed over. *What would you think of the man, who would be hardy enough to rise in this House, and propose to make all our taxes perpetual? yet this must be the necessary step towards this measure.* In answer to this formidable objection, formidable indeed, if true, I reply, that it makes no tax perpetual, which you did not propose to make perpetual by the system of 1785; by that system, you proposed to make the duties between the two kingdoms perpetual, to make a tribute perpetual—the present system only perpetuates those duties for twenty years, and does not levy a tribute at all. The United Parliament may lower the salt tax, may lower the hop tax, it cannot raise them for twenty years; and the whole principle of the measure retains to the

United Parliament all its constitutional powers of raising or stopping supplies, and merely provides that when it does consent to grant supplies, it shall not exact from Ireland more than her just proportion.

I WILL pass over two objections without remark. 1st, That the present plan does not provide for varying the relative number of our representatives, in proportion to the changes in our wealth and trade; and 2d, your apprehension of His Majesty's prerogative being injured, as to his power of creating peers, and of his being deprived of the advice of His hereditary counsellors.

I NOW come to your lamentation, that the Union will not be *complete*; that we *shall have indeed one Parliament, but every thing else distinct*—that the real question is, *Parliament or no Parliament?*

I ADMIT your state of the question, because if the Parliaments of the two kingdoms be once identified, if there be but one organ in the Empire for the expression of the national voice, and of the Imperial will, all other points of distinction will gradually vanish, or become trifling and immaterial.

WHAT, Sir, is the case of Scotland? The common law of Scotland is different from that of England; the tenures of land are different; the church establishment is different; Scotland has still a separate civil establishment, separate boards of customs and excise, a different land-tax, different excises, and in great part of Scotland there is a different language; yet, to all the real and essential purposes of incorporation, the Scotch Union is perfect. Scotland feels no distinct interests from those of Great Britain; she has no separate objects; she is governed by the same representatives, and influenced by the same general will. And what is the reason that all these circumstances of distinctness produce no diversity of conduct, no separation of views? It is this:

this: Scotland and England are governed by one and the same administration, by one and the same Parliament, by which the general interests of the two constituent parts are comprehensively consulted and combined in every act of the government and the legislature.

THE same will be the situation of Ireland, when once her Parliament shall be blended and incorporated with the British Parliament, and there shall be one representative body for the whole Empire, where all the concerns of all the parts of that Empire shall be equally and impartially contemplated and regulated. Then will all the petty distinctions of two treasuries, different systems of taxation, different constitution of peerage, be seen and felt no more.

DISTINCTNESS will cease in fact, when there will be no Theatre to play the game upon. Separation will be impossible, when there shall be no instrument to effect it.

You next take up the religious question by saying, *it has nothing to do with the Union, except as it is introduced by the promoters of the measure to alarm and divide the country.* What then, Sir, was it the measure of Union that two hundred years ago roused that question? Was it the measure of Union that produced the rebellion of Tyrone? The calamities of 1641? The civil war at the revolution? Was it the question of Union which brought forward the Catholic claims since 1782? Their demand of right to political equality? Their Convention in Back-lane? Or was it the question of Union which produced the rebellion which followed, and which has been so deeply tinged with religious gall? And how are we to lay this question at rest without an Union? How are we in our separate state to exclude those rights, which are founded in the physical consequence of four to one, and at the same time to preserve internal tranquillity,—or how are we to admit those rights, without surrendering all security for the Protestant Establishment, and Constitution of Ireland?

It

It is, Sir, this dangerous and inevitable dilemma, from which we see no possibility of extricating ourselves in our separate situation, which makes the majority of the prudent, the rational, the informed part of the community, look to an Union as the only means to effect the political salvation of Ireland. And you appear so sensible to the force of this dilemma, and the difficulty of giving it a solution, that you are driven to exclude the religious question from debate, in order to avoid the necessary consequences which flow from its discussion.

I believe, Sir, there is not a more rational or firm Protestant in Ireland than yourself; you saw, long ago, the tendency of bringing forward the religious question, and you freely gave your strong and prophetic sentiments on that subject, and you recapitulated your arguments in 1793 in the following words:

“ I have shewn, that you are not bound to give franchise
 “ as a right, that you cannot grant it as a favor, without
 “ hazarding the overthrow of the Protestant church, the
 “ Hanover succession, and our connexion with Great Britain ;
 “ that even if you could do it without such hazard, the
 “ mass of the Catholic body is unfit to exercise it with
 “ safety and advantage, that such a grant will make every
 “ Catholic an advocate for the worst species of Reform,
 “ where numbers and not property are to influence.”

Such were your words in 1793; how nearly your prediction has been verified is lamentably notorious. *You* may see salvation in turning away your eyes from the subject; *you* may see security in avoiding its discussion. But surely it would be a wiser part to admit and to investigate the evil; and, if there should appear to be one only remedy, to adopt that remedy with cheerfulness.

Your remaining objections are, that *there will be a compensation for boroughs, and patronage will be increased*: But, surely,
 the

the latter may be properly reduced by the United Parliament, and the former must be admitted to be necessary, both to secure a fair discussion of the question, and an equitable indemnity for the loss of property and privilege.

THERE is not a person of the slightest information in the kingdom, that does not know that the close Boroughs of Ireland have been considered as property for these 100 years; that they even make part of family settlements; that they are sold and conveyed from one proprietor to another like common Estates; and, if this property has been recognized, both in and out of Parliament for a century, would it not be the height of injustice that the proprietor should be deprived of them without an equitable compensation? The natural justice of this sentiment has been so generally prevalent that, among the many schemes of reform proposed by the delegates of the people, when they used formerly to meet in convention, a compensation for Boroughs was seldom omitted. But, the great advantage of compensation is, that it enables a fair discussion of the question of Union, to take place which could not have been procured by other means. If a measure is to be brought forward of public utility, which affects the private property of individuals how could those individuals debate such a measure impartially, unless a provision be made, that whatever be the decision, private property shall not be injured?

COMPENSATION cannot act as influence, because it is to be general, and equally attaches on the opposition as on government Members.

NETHER can it operate as corruption, if it be given generally, and does not exceed the value of the franchise surrendered.

THE only remaining topic of your speech is, what relates to the *sense of the people*? But that question has been so amply debated in Parliament, and the means taken by opposition

position to influence the popular mind, have been so effectually exposed, as to require at present no additional illustration.

THE more I consider the great subject of Union, the more do I feel convinced that, to use the Lord Lieutenant's words, "it will be ultimately as much the wish, as it is undoubtedly the interest of the people to effect it." It will daily grow in the public favour, and gain upon the general esteem, in proportion as it is explained and understood; and I consider every man, who honestly devotes himself to this purpose, is the real friend of his country. Concealment and misstatement of the truth, aided by the influence of authority, are the only enemies of the measure; and if it can be guarded from these adversaries, the Union will be carried with the concurrent voice of the whole nation.

INFLUENCED by these sentiments, I have freely examined every paragraph of your performance, and have felt my conviction of the necessity of an Union, confirmed by every sentence.

WHEN I reflect upon the manner in which you endeavoured to gloss over the miseries and distractions of your country; when I mark your anxiety, to seclude our religious differences from discussion; when I see you endeavour to bolster up our financial situation, by calculations of revenue and expence, which cannot be supported; when I observe you flying off from the principles of that commercial system, which you introduced in 1785, and defending the exploded doctrine of prohibitory duties; and when I find you argue in favour of a Constitution, *theoretically dependent*, and against a Constitution *theoretically Independent*, you must excuse me if I can no longer submit to the dictation of your authority; and if I have endeavoured, by shewing the ground it stands upon to diminish its influence. The public, when it shall no longer be misinformed, will cease to be misled.

I AM, &c. &c.

D.

I OMITTED to remark on your *appendix*. But is it not inconceivable that you should not be able to lay before the public a common table of duties without an apparent intention to mislead.

Your table is made out in the following form:

Articles.	Existing duties in British money.		Duties, Should the Union take place, in Irish money.
	Amount in British currency.	How charged, if not per centum.	

who would not suppose from this form of statement, that the duties at present were calculated in British money and on British values, and that after the Union the values were continued, as at present calculated, in British money, and the duties to be charged in Irish currency; so that the protecting duties after the Union, would not be 10 per cent. as proposed, but only 9l. 4s. 7d. $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. Ten per cent. is ten cent. whatever be the currency; and, as you could not be ignorant of this plain fact, I must leave you to reconcile to the public the principles on which you found your table.

FINIS.

